

Attorney Docket: 112.P14211

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 14 2007

REMARKSStatus of Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. In this response, claims 1-4, 6 and 10-13 have been amended to clarify intended subject matter, and claims 18-21 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that there is adequate support in the specification for the amendments to claims 1-4, 6 and 10-13 as well as new claims 18-21. For example, support may be found in the specification, figures, and claims as filed. Furthermore, the amendments to claims 1-4, 6 and 10-13 and new claims 18-21 introduce no new matter.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C §102(b)

In the Final Office Action, dated December 14, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Palevich (U.S. Pat. No. 5,630,131). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Assignee respectfully submits that Palevich does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims, as required by 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and, therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the claims are not anticipated by Lo under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Although Palevich describes an object oriented programming library employed to construct a set of objects in a particular language, Palevich does not show or describe "redrawing the user interface in the second language by replacing the first language with one or more of the language strings of the external language file without closing the application", as recited in claim 1. In Palevich, language is not replaced, but, rather, an object archive hierarchy is employed to construct a set of objects according to a particular "locale". For example, as stated in col 4:38 – col 4:57 of Palevich,

In order to facilitate "localization", or preparation of an application developed in one language for use in an "area" or a locale which uses another language, the user interface objects are stored in a hierarchical locale tree within the archive. As the tree proceeds away from the root locale the locales become more-and-more specific as to language. All objects are stored in the base or root of the hierarchy, but only those objects which require a translation are stored in an area associated with a more specific locale. At runtime, a complete collection of objects is assembled by starting at the desired locale and proceeding up the hierarchy level-by-level. Translated objects at lower levels of the hierarchy "override" those at higher levels so that the most complete translations of each object are obtained during this search.

Accordingly, Palevich fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, and a sufficient showing of anticipation has not been established.

Assignee respectfully submits that because a sufficient showing of anticipation has not been established, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-16 either depend from or include limitations similar to those in claim 1, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. It is noted, that many other bases for traversing the rejections could be provided, but Assignee believes that the grounds presented above are sufficient. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims, and allow all pending claims to proceed to allowance.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Palevich in view of Chou (US Patent No. 5,583,761). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is noted that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (MPEP § 2142). It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not meet these criteria. For example, the cited art, alone or in combination, still does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Beginning with claim 9, as set forth above, Palevich does not show or describe "redrawing the user interface in the second language by replacing the first language with one or more of the language strings of the external language file without closing the application", as recited in claim 1, from which

claim 9 depends. Furthermore, Chou fails to cure this deficiency of Palevich, and accordingly, even if Palevich were successfully combined with Chou, although Assignee does not concede that a combination would be possible, any resultant combination would still not include at least the limitations noted above.

Although Chou describes a method for intercepting and translating interface messages, Chou does not teach or suggest "redrawing the user interface in the second language by replacing the first language with one or more of the language strings of the external language file without closing the application", as recited in claim 1, from which claim 9 depends. Accordingly, Chou fails to cure the deficiency noted in Palevich.

Therefore, any combination of Palevich with Chou would still fail to teach or suggest at least the claim limitations of claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to meet the requirements for a *prima facie* showing of obviousness, and claim 9 is a condition for allowance. Additionally, claim 17 includes similar limitations as those of claim 9, and is therefore not rendered obvious for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 9 and 17 and allow all pending claims to proceed to allowance. Furthermore, new claims 18-21 include limitations similar to those in one or more of claims 1-4 and 6-17, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Additionally, it is noted that the Assignee's omission to comment directly upon all of the positions asserted by the Examiner in the office action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with those asserted positions. For example, Assignee does not agree or acquiesce to Examiner's position as to whether there is any suggestion to combine the cited documents or whether there would be any reasonable expectation of success from making such a combination.

Attorney Docket: 112.P34214

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 14 2007

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in this patent application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, she is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 439-6500. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account number 50-3703.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 14, 2007

/Michael J. Willardson/

Michael J. Willardson  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 50,856

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLP  
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240  
Beaverton, OR 97006  
(503) 439-6500  
Customer No. 43831

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
deposited via facsimile with the Commissioner for  
Patents on March 14, 2007.

  
Leslie C. Ray